

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-3501/300585.03  
Application No.: 10/786,313  
Interview Summary Dated: September 1, 2009

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:  
**Ravipal S. Soin**

Confirmation No.: **3447**

Application No.: **10/786,313**

Group Art Unit: **2442**

Filing Date: **February 25, 2004**

Examiner: **Jason D. Recek**

For: **Systems and Methods for Projecting Content from Computing Devices**

Mail Stop Issue Fee  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

Date of Interview: August 27, 2009

Interview Type: ☐ Personal ☒ Telephonic ☐ Electronic Mail ☐ Video Conference ☐  
Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Participants:

From PTO: (Include Name and Title)

1. Jason Recek, Examiner
2. Andrew Caldwell, Supervisory Patent Examiner
- 3.

For Applicant:

1. Joseph F. Oriti, Attorney
- 2.

☐ An exhibit or demonstration was included and is described below:

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

The claims discussed included: 1.

The ☐art ☐prior art discussed included:

An agreement ☐was ☐was not reached ☒N/A.

☐It was agreed that the attached claims are allowable.

☐It was agreed that the attached amendment would be entered.

☒The interview is summarized below.

Examiner Recek and Supervisory Examiner Caldwell are thanked for the telephone interview conducted on August 27, 2009. Applicant's representative questioned why a supplemental oath/declaration was being required. Examiners stated that claims had been amended during prosecution and that under 37 CFR 1.67, they were entitled to require a supplemental oath/declaration to ensure that inventorship of the amended claims was correct. The definition of "statement of the invention" as recited in 37 CFR 1.67 was discussed. No agreements were reached as to the definition of "statement of the invention." Applicant's representative asked if it was Examiners' practice to require a supplemental oath/declaration in all applications in which claims were amended. Examiners responded no. Applicant's representative indicated that it appears that the requirement for a supplemental oath/declaration was being applied arbitrarily. Applicant's representative asked for an objective standard by which it was determined when a supplemental oath/declaration should be required. Applicant's representative explained that knowledge of such a standard would allow the Applicant to obtain a supplemental oath/declaration prior to receiving a Notice of Allowance, thus avoiding the possibility of having to pull the case from allowance in order to obtain a supplemental oath/declaration. No object standard was given.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 30, 2009

/Joseph F. Oriti/  
Joseph F. Oriti  
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439